

**REMARKS**

The Final Office Action mailed August 20, 2007, has been received and reviewed. Claims 10 through 31 are currently pending in the application. Claim 21 stands rejected. Claims 22 through 31 have been objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but the indication of allowable subject matter in such claims is noted with appreciation. Applicant proposes to amend claim 21 to include the subject matter of dependent claim 29. New claims 32-34 are added. Claims 30 and 31 are proposed to be amended to depend from claim 21. Claim 29 is canceled. No new matter is added. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Obviousness Rejections**

Obviousness Rejection Based on WO 97/03469 to Krautschnieder, referring to the English equivalent U.S. Patent 5,943,572 to Krautschnieder, in view of U.S. Patent 5,511,020 to Hu

Claim 21 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Krautschnieder (WO 97/03469), referring to the English equivalent U.S. Patent No. 5,943,572 to Krautschnieder, in view of Hu et al. U.S. Patent No. 5,511,020). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection, as hereinafter set forth.

Dependent claim 29 was indicated as allowable if rewritten in independent form. (Office Action, page 5). Claim 29 has been canceled. Claim 21 is proposed to be amended to include the limitations of canceled claim 29. Accordingly, claim 21 should be in condition for allowance.

**Objections to Claims 22 through 31/Allowable Subject Matter**

Claims 22 through 31 stand objected to as being dependent upon rejected base claims, but are indicated to contain allowable subject matter and would be allowable if placed in appropriate independent form. Applicant respectfully submits that independent claim 21, from which claims 22 through 28, 30 and 31 depend, is allowable. Claims 22, 26 and 27 have been rewritten in independent form as new claims 32-34 respectively.

### ENTRY OF AMENDMENTS

The proposed amendments to claims 21, 30 and 31 above and new claims 32-34 should be entered by the Examiner because the amendments are supported by the as-filed specification and drawings and do not add any new matter to the application. Further, the amendments do not raise new issues or require a further search. Finally, if the Examiner determines that the amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance, entry is respectfully requested upon filing of a Notice of Appeal herein.

### CONCLUSION

Claims 10 through 28, and 30-34 are believed to be in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is respectfully solicited. Should the Examiner determine that additional issues remain which might be resolved by a telephone conference, he is respectfully invited to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,



Krista Weber Powell  
Registration No. 47,867  
Attorney for Applicant  
TRASKBRITT  
P.O. Box 2550  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84110-2550  
Telephone: 801-532-1922

Date: October 16, 2007  
KWP/smt:lmh  
Document in Prolaw